

REMARKS

The Applicants and the undersigned thank Examiner Wong for her careful review of this application. The Applicants greatly appreciate the indication of allowable subject matter in Claims 2, 5, and 15.

Claims 1, 3-4, 6-14, and 16 have been rejected. Upon entry of this amendment, allowed Claims 5 and 15 have been cancelled while Claims 1-4, 6-14, and 16 remain pending. The independent claims for this application are Claims 1, 2, and 13.

The allowable subject matter of cancelled Claims 5 and 15 has been inserted into their respective independent claims (Claims 1 and 13). Allowed dependent Claim 2 has been changed to an independent claim.

Claim Objections

The Examiner objected to Claim 3 because the variable “N” was not defined. The Examiner suggested that the Applicants amend this claim to define “N” as an integer. The Applicants appreciate the Examiner’s helpful suggestion. The Applicants have adopted her suggestion in this paper. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of this objection are respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103

The Examiner rejected Claims 1, 3, and 10-12 as being unpatentable over EP Patent No. 0967763 issued in the name of Leus et al. (hereinafter, the “Leus reference”) in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 20030195913, published in the name of Murphy (hereinafter, the “Murphy reference”).

The Examiner rejected Claim 4 under U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Lexus reference in view of the Murphy reference, and further in view of printed publication entitled, “Per Tone Equalization for DMT-Based Systems,” authored by Van Acker et al. (hereinafter, the “Van Acker reference”).

The Examiner rejected Claims 6-9 under U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Leus reference in view of the Murphy reference, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,106,789 issued in the name of Rezvani (hereinafter, the “Rezvani reference”).

The Examiner rejected Claims 13-14 under U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Leus reference in view of the Murphy reference, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,735,255 issued in the name of Smart et al. (hereinafter, the “Smart reference”).

The Examiner rejects Claim 16 as being unpatentable over Leus reference in view of the Murphy reference and Smart reference, and further in view of the Van Acker reference.

The Applicants respectfully offer remarks to traverse these rejections. The Applicants have cancelled allowed dependent Claims 5 and 15 and have inserted the allowable subject matter of these dependent claims into their respective independent claims, namely independent Claims 1 and 13. The Applicants have also made allowed dependent Claim 2 into an independent claim. Therefore, these changes to the claims have rendered the Examiner’s rejections based on the prior art as moot. Accordingly, reconsideration, withdrawal of these rejections, and an early notice of allowability are requested.

CONCLUSION

The foregoing is submitted as a full and complete response to the FINAL Office Action mailed on January 9, 2008. The Applicants and the undersigned thank Examiner Wong for the consideration of these remarks. The Applicants respectfully submit that the present application is in condition for allowance. Such Action is hereby courteously solicited.

If any issues remain that may be resolved by telephone, the Examiner is requested to call the undersigned at 404.572.2884.

Respectfully submitted,

/SPW/

Steven P. Wigmore

Reg. No. 40,447

King & Spalding LLP

34th Floor

1180 Peachtree Street, N.E.

Atlanta, Georgia 30309-3521

404.572.4600

K&S Docket: 09752.105001